COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XIII. No. 15.] LONDON, SATURDAY, APRIL 9, 1808. [PRICE 10D.

"France has but to suspend her navigation laws and the seas are filled with vessels that bring home her "commerce. The English cruizers have domineered over the sea; but, like crows, that are scared by a "bundle of rags, no sooner does a piece of bunten, marked with thirteen stripes, depend from the mast "head, than our brave sailors are compelled to sheer off, and the wealth and commerce of France are "carried as safely over the Atlantic, as if lodged in a British 74. She has millions floating which no "enemy can reach; she enjoys every benefit of her colonies without the risk of capture or detention; "she may fit out nothing but privateers and cruizers to attack our trade, and distress our colonies, whilst "her own are beyond the efforts of our armed vessels. She lets out her colonies to farm upon a rack rent, "which rent she is sure to receive, as she is the only customer for the neat produce; and thus, by a "contrivance as ingenious and fortunate for herself, as it is ruinous for us, she unites the whole benefits of "war with all the security of peace."——BELL'S WEEKLY MESSENGER, previous to the issuing of the Orders in Council.

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

AMERICAN STATES.——I was in hopes, that, after my last number, there would have been no further necessity of saying any thing more about this enemy in disguise; but, a publication, which has appeared under the title of a Debate in the House of Lords, and which publication includes certain resolutions, said to have been proposed to that House by Lord Holland (one of the persons who negociated and concluded the treaty sent back by Mr Thomas Jefferson), demands particular attention. There are other subjects, which, in point of national importance, would command a preference, such, for instance, as the proceedings upon the *reversion bill*; but, this subject commands a preference in point of *time*. The American new negociators are coming; and, it is expedient that the public be put upon its guard against the numerous tricks, which the American fundholders and merchants will play off, while the negociation is going on. The debate took place on the 29th of last month, and the resolutions, proposed by Lord Holland, were as follows:——"I. "That it appears to this house, that his "majesty hath been advised, without any "alleged provocation from the United "States of America, to issue Orders in "Council, on and subsequent to the 11th "of Nov. 1807, for interrupting nearly the "whole of the commerce of the said states "with the continent of Europe; for limiting such trade to be carried on in future "through British ports only (with the exception of neutral and allied ports in certain cases) thereby exposing it to such restrictions and duties, and even prohibitions, as the government of Great Britain may think fit to impose upon it; and for confiscating the property of the citizens "of the said states, in all cases where the "same shall be accompanied by particular "documents certifying the place of its "growth or manufacture.——II. That it "appears to this house, that previous to the "issuing of the said Orders in Council, a "negociation had been carried on between "this country and the United States of "America for the maintenance of peace "and friendship between them, and that a "treaty had been actually signed respecting "some of the most material points in dis-"cussion; that a desire had been expressed "by the government of the said United "States for the addition of certain other "provisions to the said treaty, and that a "proposal was made for renewing the ne-"gociation for that purpose; but that this "offer was abruptly and intemperately re-"jected by his majesty's ministers.—— "III. That at the time when the said Or-"ders were issued, his majesty's ministers "had recently received from the ministers "of the United States in this kingdom as-"surances that the injurious decrees of his "majesty's enemies had not, in any one in-"stance, been executed against the com-"merce or navigation of the United States: "and that from all that had passed subse-"quent to the issuing of the said decrees, "his majesty's ministers had every reason "to conclude, that any attempt of the ene-"my so to execute the same, would be de-"cidedly resisted by the government of the "United States; whereby it must have "happened, either that the said decrees "would have continued to be wholly nuga-"tory and ineffectual, or that the enemy, "by endeavouring to enforce the same, "would have driven the United States into "a closer connection with this country.— "IV. That it appears to this house, that the "Order issued by his majesty in council, on "the 7th of Jan 1807, was not intended to

" interrupt neutrals in a commerce of dis-
" charge from port to port of the enemies'
" territories; that such was understood to
" be its legal construction by those who
" were in his majesty's service at the time
" the said Order was issued; and that an
" explanation to that effect was given by
" them to the Danish minister, in an official
" note dated on the 17th of March, 1807.—
" V That in a note from the American Se-
" cretary of State to Mr. Erskine, dated on
" the 20th of the same month, considerable
" uneasiness was expressed, under an ap-
" prehension of a contrary interpretation of
" the said Order: That although the above
" mentioned note was actually received by
" his majesty's present ministers in the
" month of April last, yet no steps have
" been taken thereon up to the present
" hour, for removing the unfounded ap-
" prehensions of the American government
" on a point to which they appear to have
" attached so much importance: That by
" this omission, much unnecessary irritation
" has been suffered to prevail in America,
" long after it was in the power of his ma-
" jesty's ministers to have effectually re-
" moved the same; and fresh obstacles to
" conciliation and friendship have thus wan-
" tonly been interposed.——VI. That it is,
" therefore, the opinion of this house, that
" the said Orders are in themselves unjust
" and impolitic; that the issuing of them at
" the time, and under the circumstances
" above mentioned, was an act of the ut-
" most improvidence and rashness; and
" that, by abruptly breaking off a friendly
" negociation, and withholding a satisfacto-
" ry explanation on a point, on which it
" might have been given with so much ease
" and advantage, his majesty's ministers
" have acted in disregard of our true policy,
" which is to cultivate the friendship of a
" nation, whose interests and prosperity are
" so intimately interwoven with our own;
" and have conducted themselves in a man-
" ner the least adapted to enable his majesty
" to maintain that maritime superiority, on
" which the greatness, and even the exist-
" ence of his empire so much depend."——
These resolutions were negatived by a very great majority; but, that is not quite sufficient to satisfy me. I wish to shew my readers, that they merited their fate.—— The first resolution barely states well-known facts, except as far as relates to the provocation given by America. It was, upon that ground, perhaps, proper to negative the resolution; else I, for my part, should have been glad to see it pass in the affirmative; for, certainly, one object of the Orders in Council was to knock up the trade of America with France and all her dependent states.——The second resolution censures the refusal, on the part of the present ministers, to resume the negociation with America upon the basis of the treaty, which Mr. Thomas Jefferson had sent back, with marginal notes, like amended articles of capitulation. " The American government," Lord Holland's resolution says, " expressed to " have certain conditions added to the said " treaty, and proposed to renew the nego- " ciation, for that purpose; but, that this " proposal was *intemperately* rejected by " his Majesty's present ministers." To those, who had thought it quite becoming in a king of England to enter upon a negociation respecting objects, in order to accomplish which, the other party had passed an act of non-importation; to men who could advise the king to enter upon a negociation with an openly avowed rod shaking over his shoulders; to men of this humble and submissive cast of mind, the turning of the poor worm, when trodden upon, would, doubtless, appear to be an act of " intemperance." But, to those who have not the good fortune to be made wholly of earth, I think, that the rejection of the proposition of Mr. Thomas Jefferson will appear to have been marked with mildness, rather than with intemperance. The case stood thus: Thomas wished to obtain from England several concessions, the chief of which was, that she should, by positive stipulation, give up her right to search for her own seamen, on board of American ships, such ships being in all parts of the world, and every where offering to our sailors the easy means of desertion. In order to accomplish his objects, Thomas (his christian name, like that of any other potentate, is enough) sends an embassy to England, or rather, he sends over a negociator to *assist* his minister already here. But, lest the eloquence of these two should fail, he procures to be passed, previous to the departure of his negociator, an act of Congress, enabling him, whenever he should judge proper, to prohibit the importation of certain English goods; or, in other words, to cramp and embarrass, as he and the Congress thought, the commerce and the finances of England; and this act, it was openly declared, was intended to be put in execution, the moment England refused to make the demanded concessions. Under such circumstances would you, reader, had you been a minister of England, have advised the king of England to enter upon a negociation with Thomas? Who, amongst my readers, is there, owing a sum of money to his

neighbour, and seeing that neighbour accompany his demand of payment with the shaking of a horsewhip at the creditor; who, amongst the English people, is there, that would, under such circumstances, consent, for one moment, even to *talk* about the debt? Which of them would not say: "lay down "your whip; beg my pardon for the out- "rageous insult; and then I will discuss "with you the subject of your demand, but "until you do that, I set you at defiance?" If such ought to be the conduct of every man, in the case of a *just* demand, accompanied with an insulting threat, what ought to be his conduct in the case of an *unjust* demand, accompanied with a similar threat? Yet did the late ministry enter on a negociation without saying, as far as the public has heard, one single syllable about the non-importation act, which was suspended from time to time, in order to see how they would behave. Their treaty was, at last, returned by Mr. Thomas Jefferson, accompanied with the "additions," which he wished to have made. "No," said the present ministers, "we will not *renew* the old negociation "with you. We shall be happy to treat "with you upon a *new* basis; but, we will "have nothing to do with the amended ar- "ticles of capitulation." As a step *previous* to negociation, *they* would, I hope, have demanded a repeal of the non importation act; a laying aside of the horse-whip. It is said, that "America has a right to pass "what laws she pleases to regulate the "trade carried on with her." Very true; and we have just as good a right to determine whether we shall enter upon a negociation with her, or not. Your taylor, for instance, has an undoubted right to buy his cloth of another draper, and not of you; but, have you not as good a right to employ another taylor? I know there is no *law* to prevent the Americans from being outrageously insolent to us; but, I also know, that there is no law to prevent us from resenting that insolence. Let them pass acts of non-importation, 'till the very stones in the street rise up against their stupid vanity; but, let not the said acts be pointed solely at England; let them not think to bully us out of any thing. Mr. Canning's letter, refusing to renew the negociation upon the basis of the amended articles of capitulation (for I can call the treaty nothing else), was, in my opinion, rather too condescending towards America. It did resent the insult; but, it did not resent it in terms sufficiently strong. Tameness towards America has, all along, been the fault of England; nor need we much wonder at it, when we consider the great influence, the numerous *votes*, of those, who, either directly or indirectly, have been, and still are, so deeply interested in the funds and lands and trade of America. The questions, which I, some time ago, put to Mr. Alexander Baring, touching his American citizenship; his ownership of American vessels; his trade in those vessels to the countries of our enemy; and his ownership of American stock, being the amount of the loan, with which America purchased Louisiana of France: these questions that famous petitioner, and his no less famous puff-publisher, of the Morning Chronicle, have suffered to remain unanswered. The process, by which we were to be *done* out of our maritime rights was curious enough. "King Cong" talks big and threatens. His fund and land and ship owners here assemble, issue their circular letters, plague the ministers, and, at last, come to parliament with a petition, in which they declare, that unless matters are arranged with "King Cong," England will be ruined. He brags of his resources and his power; but they talk of his inability to pay them, if England destroy his trade. He cuts off his resources by his own act, and his minions here blame the ministers for making him poor. "You "shall yield to me," says he, "your right "of searching for seamen, or I will pass a "non-importation act and lay an embargo." "For God's sake," cry the minions, "pre- "vent his passing the act and laying the "embargo, for, if he does it, we shall not "be paid what he owes us;" and, it follows, of course that we are to yield to him the right, for that only will prevent him from passing his act and laying his embargo. It was upon the influence of this his faction here, that "King Cong" relied for the carrying of his ends; and, if the late ministers had remained in power, there is, I think, sufficient proof, that he would have succeeded.——To the third resolution of Lord Holland, the letter which will be found at the end of this Summary may serve as an answer ——*What reason* had "the ministers "to conclude, that any attempt of the ene- "my to execute the decree would be de- "cidedly *resisted* by America?" What reason? I can discover none, any where; and as to the "*driving*" of the United States into "a closer connection with this country," alas for the poor nation, if governed by men who could really entertain the hope. Let Lord Holland read Mr. Thomas Jefferson's newspapers, of which I will presently give him a few extracts, and then talk, if he can, about America being driven into a closer connection with England.——The fourth

and fifth resolutions shew, that, if the late ministers did understand their own Order in Council, nobody else did.——The sixth resolution, which is a recapitulation of the former ones, contains, besides, the sentiment, that it is our true policy to cultivate the friendship of America, because "her interests and prosperity are *intimately interwoven with our own.*" The close of his lordship's speech, as reported in the Morning Chronicle, before referred to, amplifies the expression of this sentiment. "When "we saw all Europe under the dominion of "one man, pressing and urging forward "plans inimical to the interests and happiness of mankind, we might have looked to "America for that order of things, congenial with our own feelings and our own "views; and as forming a counterpoise to "the power of the ruler of the continent." What does this mean, reader? I fancy it must mean, that, if the Orders in Council had not been issued, America would have joined us against France. If this be not the meaning, I am sure I do not know what it is, and cannot even guess what it is. But, if this be the meaning of his lordship, I venture to assert, that his lordship has been most grossly deceived. The Berlin decree was passed long before Mr. Jefferson made his last Congress speech; long before the American newspapers proposed a subscription for giving rewards to deserters from our ships of war; long before our men were inveigled away at Norfolk and New York; long before the toasts about the "liberty of the seas" at Rochefort and St. Petersburgh. But, Lord Holland and others have asserted, that the embargo arose out of our Orders in Council, and they have appealed to the American newspapers for proof of the truth of this assertion. Let us, reader, appeal to those same newspapers. In the AURORA, a paper devoted to Mr. Jefferson, the "*chief* cause" of the embargo is stated, as follows: "A proclamation of the British govern- "ment, asserting her right, and declaring "her determination to pursue a line of "conduct on the ocean incompatible with "the hitherto universally acknowledged "laws of nations, a conduct which has been "*the subject of dispute between that govern-* "*ment and ours for several years past*, and "to which she was well assured, that we "could not assent, without sacrificing our "national honour and independence." This is stated as the chief cause of the embargo; and, though it appears, that our approaching Orders of Council had some weight, what is the consequence, seeing that Thomas and the Congress appear not to have relinquished the project of forcing us to abandon the right of search? Embargo or war or some hostile act must have come; and, therefore, it is not the Orders of Council, but the resolution of England not to yield her maritime rights, that is to blame. To this point I have made many attempts to hold the citizens, who have speechified and petitioned against the Orders of Council. They seem to have no ears or tongues or pens for this question about searching for seamen, though it is manifest, that this is the question, upon which the two countries have, at last, come to an open quarrel.——I wish to satisfy the public mind upon this point. I wish to convince all men, that it is not the Orders in Council which have produced the hostile measures of America. For this purpose, I take another extract, from the same paper (The Philadelphia Aurora), of the 17th of February, some weeks after the Orders in Council had been received in America. "Much has "been said of the pacific disposition of the "British cabinet, much of their ardent de- "sire for peace and reconciliation; but "since the arrival of the king of England's "'squally' *proclamation*, which speaks a "language which cannot be misunderstood, "we hope to hear no more of this. The "determination of the English ministry, "expressed through their royal engine, *to* "*resist our claims* and insist upon our sub- "mission, is unequivocal. It now remains "for our government to say *whether they* "*will tread back the steps they have taken* "to procure us justice, or whether by a "manful advance they will convince the "enemies of America and the world that "we are not to be bullied out of our rights "or intimidated to surrender our indepen- "dence. There is no room now for quib- "bling or sophistry. The question is a "plain one. Shall we defend or shall we "comply? As there can be no evasion there "should be no hesitation, we know the men "whom we have placed at the helm of our "ship too well to suppose them capable of "yielding to the exactions of foreign com- "manders, or of striking the colours while "there are hands ready to support them.— "Principles of delicacy, of courtesy, of for- "bearance, it seems to us, should have "taught a foreign court, while a negocia- "tion was pursuing with a neutral nation, "to refrain from publishing to the world its "ultimate, its irremediable decision upon "the most material points of that negocia- "tion. Was ever an instance heard so sin- "gular, so opposite to the customs of civi- "lized nations as the present. The United "States and England differ upon this *in-*

" *portant* point, *the right of search*, to ad-
" just the difficulty and restore harmony if
" possible, special instructions and authority
" are communicated to our ministers at
" London; proposals are made to the Bri-
" tish government. They promise to re-
" turn an answer, and while it is hourly
" expected; on a sudden appears a procla-
" mation of that government, which pre-
" cludes all further discussion upon the
" principal object of negociation; refuses to
" hear either argument or reason, and says,
" my determination is fixed; submit or
" feel the effects of my displeasure. The
" measure appears to be a gross, a studied
" insult upon our national dignity; it seems
" intended as a ridicule upon our modera-
" tion, at the same time that it is a menace
" to frighten us from the ground we have
" taken."——How false these facts, how fallacious this reasoning, it is needless, at this day to show, the subject having already undergone so ample a discussion. All I wished to show, by the quoting of this paper was, that it was the question of *searching for seamen*, and not the Orders in Council, that was, and is regarded as of importance, in America. As this writer says, the two countries are really at issue upon this question. The king has declared, that he *never* will yield the right of search, and the Americans have declared, that they will not submit to the exercise of that right. They would, it is very likely, complain as loudly as Mr. Baring does of the Orders in Council; but, this they cannot do, without complaining of *France* also, and their base partiality for that power will not suffer them to do that.—— The American papers, which now lye before me, down to the 20th of February, exhibit a picture of national feeling and affairs very different from what the people of England would have expected to exist, had they believed the representations of Mr. Alexander Baring and his coadjutor, the Morning Chronicle. It will be borne in mind, that the *Aurora*, from which alone I shall quote, upon this occasion, is a paper devoted to Mr. Jefferson and his party. Let us hear, then, what sort of opinion they seem to entertain of the virtue of the members of Congress and other persons of influence in America. ——Feb. 2nd. " UNDER THE ROSE. Since
" the arrival of Mr. Erskine's colleague, at
" the seat of government, merely out of
" compliment to Mr. Rose, Mr. Erskine
" has opened a levee every *Tuesday even-*
" *ing*—and it is very handsomely attended
" by *members of both houses!*——Mr. Rose
" is not backward in politeness in return for
" these civilities. He has in the most con-
" descending manner waited on several
" members at their own lodgings, and has
" entered into very long and *innocent con-*
" *versations* with them—*sub rosa!*——We
" propose publishing, from day to day, after
" the 1st of Feb., after the manner of the
" *court papers* in London, the *names* of all
" the *gentlemen* and *ladies* who attend Mr.
" Erskine's levee, *(sub rosa)* merely for
" public amusement, and to see how *this*
" *kind of court news operates.*——*It is a*
" *fact, that fifty thousand guineas have*
" *been landed from the Statira frigate.*——
" To solve the question—Is that sum for
" secret service money? We have only to
" inspect the anglo-federal papers printed in
" all our seaports.——Could not your Parks,
" your Russels, your Langs, and your Cole-
" mans, your Relfs and your Bronsons, your
" Youngs, and your Dalchos—give some
" account of its *distribution*—the quantum
" or portion allotted to *Boston*, to New
" York, to Philadelphia, &c. &c.?"——
——Feb. 4. " The report of Mr Rose's
" *going home*, we did not believe, though
" we heard it before. Mr. Rose is come
" here to *do something*. *Bullying* and *pa-*
" *lavering* have failed: there is one re-
" source more; and that will be tried: the
" *GOLD* that has corrupted all Europe,
" and destroyed all that it has corrupted,
" *will be tried here.*"——Feb. 10. " Citi-
" zens of America, the *gold* of Britain
" must be diffused abundantly; or there is
" more profligacy in some of your citizens,
" than the vilest of despotisms produce.
" MARK THEM."——Such is the language of Mr. Jefferson's newspapers; such the confidence they repose in that republican virtue, of which they have boasted so much, and of which the poor deluded enthusistic Brissot gave the European world such a flattering picture.——The next thing I shall notice, is, the alarm, evidently excited in America, by our expedition to Denmark. I said, that this would be the case, and here is the proof of it.——Feb. 3. " This
" doctrine was advanced by English and
" American federalists. Denmark, they
" asserted, was about to throw her mite
" into the scale of France to the evi-
" dent injury of England. This was the
" cry of every pimp and agent of the cor-
" rupt government of Britain; a govern-
" ment, that is never at a loss for pretexts
" to encroach on her neighbours—it was
" this government, which without the
" shadow of proof to substantiate her in-
" famous conduct, basely and treacherously
" accomplished the destruction of the naval
" power of Denmark, and piratically invad-

" ed her territory: And why ? Because Bri-
" tain feared that her iniquity would justly
" draw down upon her own head the ven-
" geance of the whole world.——Every
" man recollects this hue and and cry about
" French influence predominating at Copen-
" hagen. It was a fruitful, nay, the only
" source of justification which the friends
" of England could use to palliate this
" " deed without a name." —— Mark the
" inevitable tendency of advocating such a
" doctrine.——If these wretches justified
" Britain *then*—will they not justify her in
" the commission of a similar act *now* when
" the U. States are charged whith being un-
" der the control of Bonaparte ? Every
" English agent and apostate American
" rings the same peal—and while they ap-
" plaud England for attacking Denmark
" they virtually invite the same power to a
" repetition of the tragic scenes recently
" exhibited at Copenhagen.——They pos-
" sessed no proof of the subserviency of
" Denmark to France—yet they jus ified
" Britain in almost annihilating that inno-
" cent nation, to appease her fears and sus-
" picions.——They possess no proof that
" America is under French influence—yet
" there are scoundrels in this country, who
" are weak and wicked enough to make the
" assertion, and thus invite hostility.——
" England never did, and never can exhibit
" evidence of the guilt of Denmark. It
" was her spies and agents there who gave
" the false information on which the govern-
" ment acted. Her spies and agents here,
" are pursuing the same course ; and they
" expect the same consequences ! —— *Our*
" *cities will be Copenhagenized—and our*
" *ships, timber, treasury, &c. will be*
" " *amicably*" *deposited in Great Britain.*"
——What ! afraid of us ? Is it possible, that the great America should be afraid of " little Britain ;" afraid of the nation, whom, but the other day, the Americans represented as expiring under the lash of France ? Oh, that example of Copenhagen has worked wonders in the world ! It will save a deal of strife, war, and bloodshed. I like to see the name of that city become a verb in the American dictionary. " Our " cities will be copenhagenized" is an ex-cellent phrase. It is very true, that Sir John Warren would copenhagenize New York with a very little trouble. Call not this the insolence of power, gentlemen ; for, recollect, that the quarrel between us arose *solely* out of *your demand upon us to yield one of our maritime rights.* After such a demand, we are at liberty to laugh at your alarms about the copenhagenizing of your cities. You thought, that the progress of Napoleon upon the continent, had broken down our spirits ; and, your generosity suggested, that this was the happy moment for you to extort from us a concession, which would have humbled us and crippled us for ever. Your generous purpose has been frustrated ; England has given the world a proof that she still is mighty ; and you, from being the threatners, are become the tremblers. Your vindictive act of non-importation is answered by the sending of a force capable of destroying your ports. Where is now all your vaunting about in-vading Jamaica and reducing Halifax to ashes ? —— The embargo is making dreadful work amongst the merchants and shop-keepers, and, indeed, amongst persons of all ranks and degrees in the country. The cry against it was, at the date of the latest intelligence, pretty general. Mr. Jeffer-son's party had been endeavouring to obtain a vote in approbation of it, in the legislative assembly of Pennsylvania ; but they had failed.——Feb. 3d. " The following is the " resolution that was negatived ; and such is " the effect produced in the legislature of " Pennsylvania, by the intrigues of men " who at this moment hold offices of con-" fidence and trust under the executive of " the United States.——WHEREAS, the go-" vernment of the United States, have " deemed it expedient and promotive of the " general interest of the nation to lay an " embargo, and we the representatives of the " people of Pennsylvania, do approve of " the wisdom and patriotism of the mea-" sure : and whereas, there are to be found " among us, persons claiming the rights of " American citizens, and enjoying all the " benefits of this free government, who are " so lost to all sense of patriotism, as to " reprobate a measure called for by the best " interests of the country : and whereas it " is incumbent upon a free people to sustain " the measures of a government constituted " by themselves, when they are obviously " interwoven with the general interest and " safety of the nation. Therefore — RE-" SOLVED, by the house of representatives " of the commonwealth of Pennsylvania, " that the embargo laid by the general go-" vernment meets our hearty and entire ap-" probation, and that we view in it a wise " measure calculated *to secure the peace of* " our country, to preserve the property of " our citizens, and to procure a redress of " our wrongs."——The failure is, the rea-der will perceive, attributed to men holding offices under Jefferson; so that there must be a division even amongst that party them-

selves ——In the mean while, it is complained of, in a paper of the 18th of February, that the "tory vessels going out of the "ports, on a *coasting* trip, trip off to *Ja-* "*maica.*" I said, that this would be the case; but, if this be the case at the end of six weeks, what will it be, at the end of six months? The party opposed to Jefferson ask: "what is the embargo for? Of what "use is it? Why do you not go to war, or "let us live at peace? Why do you keep "us in this tantalizing state?" The party of Mr. Jefferson seem enraged at these questions, and answer by threats of vengeance upon the heads of their opponents. "We will tell you," say they, "for the "benefit of your British friends. The go- "vernment of the United States, do not "wish to go to war. As long as war is "avoidable; they prefer remaining peace- "ably within their own homes to shedding "blood without unavoidable necessity. War "is neither the passion of the government "nor the interest of the people; they have "proved this to be their policy and their "wishes by more patience and suffering "than any nation ever exhibited with simi- "lar capacities for retaliation since the cre- "ation. They prefer now to remain on the "*defensive* than to injure the unfortunate "subjects of a *depraved* government—and "knowing that they can do what is effectual "whenever occasion calls for it, they wish "to put off the evil day, because when they "begin, it will be a complete work. When- "ever the United States are forced to war, "*stand clear—it will not be like the days of* "*the revolution*—the law promulged at Co- "penhagen, will then be the law of the "land—*no neutrals*—every man must be "an *active* a *decided* American—or an ene- "my—and from that day English influence "no more disturbs nor distracts this conti- "nent—not a vestige of it will remain. The "government wish to avoid the terrible "operation of war—and they will, while "the thing is practicable, preserve an *armed* "*neutrality*—when forced to war, we re- "peat it again — TORIES STAND "CLEAR!" ——Thus, as I foretold, the war they intend to carry on, is *a war upon each other*. The first three months of war would see all the *rich*, or *tories*, plundered, in one shape or another. Either by double taxes, by the occupation of their houses, by the seizing of their hay and straw and corn and pork, in the way of contribution; or else by direct fine, or confiscation. Having no foreign enemy in the country, the marauding faction would have nothing to fear. There would be another complete revolution, and one of the bloodiest, perhaps, that ever was known in the world. "The law of "Copenhagen will be the *law of the land!*" The prospect is terrible, and for this prospect the people have to thank the unnatural partiality, the vanity, the insolence, of their rulers, and themselves. Here is an instance of a nation having been brought by pure vanity, to a situation the most perilous and disgraceful that ever was witnessed. They must needs be "a great power!" They must needs dictate to England! Verily, they will repent of this for many a long day.—— The party of Jefferson are proposing (paper of the 18th) to publish the names of all those members of Congress, who speak, or vote against the measures of the President, "that "they may be *marked* ready against the *day* "*of vengeance.*" Many of these have hitherto been forward enough in their hostility towards England; and, now, it seems, they are about to receive their reward. They will, probably, find to their cost, that it is much easier to raise a popular ferment than to allay it.——In my last, I spoke about the keeping of *St. Tammany's* day, in America. One of the papers, now before me, furnishes an advertisement relating to a meeting of this sort. "A stated meet- "ing of the Tammany Society will be "held, on Thursday evening next, the 4th "of the *month of Snows*, at the *council fire* "of their *great wigwam*, No. 63, north "Fourth street, precisely at the *going down* "*of the sun.*—By order of the society,— "JOHN L. BAKER, Sec.—*Month of Colds*, "29,—year of *discovery* 316."—Was there ever folly equal to this? This was an invention of Jefferson, Madison, Munroe, Dr. Rush, Mackean, and some other of the leaders, to make the rising generation believe, that they were of *Indian* origin! At these meetings, the moon-stricken professors decorate themselves with feathers and baubles and skins, after the manner of the savages, and get as drunk, oh, how drunk they get upon stinking liver-burning rum, at tenpence halfpenny a quart! This is the "*enlightened* nation"! Poor fools, as if they could, by such silly devices, obliterate history, and make the children of the honest Quakers of Pennsylvania believe, that the ancestors of their neighbours to the South came from the banks of the Mississippi, instead of emigrating from Old England by consent of a righteous judge and twelve good men and true!——Corresponding with the project of *St. Tammany* was another for forming an "*American Language*"; and, one Thornton, a native, I believe, of Barbadoes, was so far encouraged to proceed in

this project as to publish a book, an elementary book for beginners! There was to be none of our characters left. The *th* was to be represented by one character; and, in short, the shape of the whole of the letters was to be changed. But still the fools would have had all the *sounds*, all the *idiom*, all the *grammatical construction*. This was, however, to be called the "American Lan-"guage;" for the wise-noddled inventor told the people, that it was disgraceful to them to acknowledge, at every breath, that they spoke the language of *slaves*. Is it any wonder, that the nation has been made mad? Is it any wonder, that they should have discovered so much malignity and so much contempt towards England? And, is it possible to open their eyes by any thing but blows? Love us they will not; but, it is quite within our power to prevent them from despising us.——I perceive, from these papers, that their famous *Federal City*, or *City of Washington*, is about to be actually abandoned, there being no prospect of its ever becoming an inhabited place. One of my sins, in their eyes, was, laughing at this foolish project. But, oh! what will become of the "*Capitol*," and the *tomb of General Washington?* There has been a legislative discussion upon the subject; and, though the Congress came to *no decision* (which is mostly the case), it is evident that the wild project must be given up. How many men have been ruined, totally ruined, by this silly project, this child of the children of vanity! They must needs have a city greater than ever before existed in the world! The *plans* of this cursed thing have induced scores of builders and mechanics to emigrate from England. They have long ago been ruined, and their families, for want of the means of returning, are now begging their bread — In the paper of the 9th of February, I find a paragraph, with which I am very much pleased. I will insert it, and endeavour to make the application.——

"There is a coincident temper, generally "united in the same characters who are "hostile to civil liberty. It is that abject "temper, which is disposed to submit to "the most despicable meannesses at the "command of a superior knave or villain, "with the hope of being sustained in de-"legated tyranny over others.——Of these "descriptions are the enemies of civil li-"berty, the foes of virtue and concord al-"ways, and in all circumstances in every "country. The bashaw who commands a "province with the proverbial tyranny of a "Turk, tells the grand seignior that it is "the vilest of his slaves who addresses him; "the priests of the Delai Lama worship "and even devour his excretions; about "thirty years ago the fashion of the silks "and ribbons worn at Paris were *kâ-kâ le* "*dauphin*. At the court of Great Britain "..... and calls it "an honour; when a wealthy native of "Asia in the British provinces, meets an "English nabob who has come to plunder "his country in an amicable way, he is under "the necessity of getting out of his palanquin "or alighting from his horse or his elephant, "lest his not being on foot should be con-"sidered as a want of respect. The ex-"amples might be extended to a volume— "it is the *hierarchy of slaves* that produces "this baseness and tyranny—and baseness "it is said descends it accumulated "meanness and insolence." —— This is very true indeed. Nothing can be more true; nothing better expressed, except the small passage that I have chosen to leave out. But, MR. DUANE, why did you not give us an example or two drawn from amongst yourselves? Do you think that baseness more rampant was ever seen, than that which is displayed by the American people? Or, do you look upon the shabby pettifoggers, whom they chose to adore, whose feet they choose to lick, as so much better than the Nabob and the Turk? You remember how the base wretches used to abuse me for exposing the despotic acts of Mackean, then chief justice and now governor of Pennsylvania. You remember how you all exulted at the final success of that man over me, aided by a jury of his vile slaves; and, now, I perceive, by your paper of the 20th of February, that those members of the assembly, who were formerly his supporters, have found out, that "he has violated the "constitution that he was sworn to support; "that he has trampled under foot the sacred "rights of freemen; that he has acted, not "as a faithful public servant, but as a des-"pot; and that, against his private re-"venge, neither age, poverty, character, "infirmity, nor patriotism has afforded "protection." Excuse me, if I am glad of this. Excuse me, if I express my joy at it. The only malediction I bestowed upon you, the abettors of Mackean, was, that his life might be as long as yours. Believe me, Mr. Duane, the reign of this man is a punishment that the state of Pennsylvania deserves. He was made to be a scourge for you; a scourge that you richly merit. It must grate you, a little, one would think, when you recollect, how powerfully instrumental you yourself were in putting the rod into his iron hand. You

must remember, when I charged him with having, while he was chief justice, said, that, if he were made governor, he would pardon any man that should murder me. You must remember, that you applauded the saying. Is it not just, then, that you should feel his despotic fangs? And, will you still hope, in the face of all your present sufferings under him, to make the world believe, that you are *freemen?*——I shall conclude with an extract or two, which may serve as a tolerably good answer to Mr. A. B. (Alexander Baring I suppose) of the Morning Chronicle, who complained of the language of our news-papers, respecting the American government and its chief; and also to Mr. Roscoe, the sapient Mr. Roscoe, who advised the king to endeavour to cherish the kind disposition of a people of an origin common with our own. Mr A B bid us beware how we spoke of the president; for, that, though he signed himself simply *Thomas Jefferson*, he was nevertheless, the sovereign of a "great nation;" and reminded us, that it was quite fair to consider the language of our public prints as the language of our government. Now, then, Mr. Baring, let us hear the language of the *Aurora*, of the 17th of February, respecting the king of England, and, observe, that this print is notoriously devoted to Mr. Jefferson.——"From the "Charleston City Gazette of Feb. 9.—— "A report was current yesterday, in this "city, of the *death* of *the king of England*, "said to have been brought by captain Mandells of the Sea Horse, which left Ramsgate on the 24th of Dec.; who states, that "a gentleman arrived that day at Ramsgate "from London, who informed him, that "when he left the city, the great bell of "St. Paul's church was tolling; which "circumstance, it is said, does not take "place but on the death of some of the "royal family; and as the king had some "days before, been stated to be indisposed, "it was concluded that he had died. London "papers of the 15th and 16th, make no mention of his sickness; but on the contrary, "state that he transacted business on the "14th with the Duke of York.——A matter of very little consequence otherwise "than there is one MONSTER less on the "earth."——Now, then, Mr. Baring, is this the language of the American government? Now, then, Mr. Roscoe, you, who profess such an ardent attachment to "his Majesty's person and family," do you approve of this? "No." But, are you willing to *resent* it? That is the point. Are you willing to resent it? Are you willing to make any of those sacrifices, of which you told the king you would be so profuse, "in defence of his person and family?"—— But, belike, it is for your *country* that you have these sacrifices at hand? Well, then, hear what these your dear friends say of that country, under its well known name of *John Bull*. I now quote the close, and recapitulation, of a string of sentiments, from the same news-paper of the 10th of February.

"Strike the string, and breathe the lay,
"Give John Bull's praises to the day;
"Is there a woman lying-in,
"Deserted infant, born in sin,
"Or sinking age, or helpless youth,
"Or maiden love, or matron truth,
"Or man disarm'd, with guileless mind,
"To John Bull's wiles or deaf or blind?
"There John Bull points his purple spear,
"Hasty, hasty rout is there,
"There confusion, terror's child,
"Conflict fierce, and ruin wild,
"Agony that pants for breath,
"Despair and unexpected death,
"These to John Bull's glory given,
"These his fame shall waft to Heaven.
"And bloody tears shall wretches weep
"When caught by John Bull—*fast asleep.*"

Now, Mr. Roscoe, how do you feel? Is this our character? are we the cowardly, cruel, deceitful race here described? At the very out-set of the dispute with America, I took occasion, in answer to an assailant, who (God forgive me if the suspicion was unjust) I took for an American; I took occasion to caution the Electors of Westminster against giving into the notion, that the Americans hated only our government. I assured those gentlemen, that the whole of the people of England were the object of American malice and abuse. My blood had to boil, for years, under this infamous abuse. I had witnessed proofs in abundance that the Americans hated us all. I had seen them make public rejoicings at the mutiny in the English fleet, at the defeat of the English army, at the scarcity of provisions in England; and, in short, at almost every event conspicuously unfavourable to England! Nor were these exultations confined to the rabble. The "constituted authorities," as they called themselves, after the French fashion, partook therein; and were imitated by many of the members of Congress. The first wish of the heart of the people of America, generally speaking, is to see England conquered, and extinguished as an independent nation; and their next wish is, that they may have a hand in it. They have, amongst them, a great number of Germans, whose malignity is proverbial, and

they have, in power, some half dozen of precious knaves from the little venomous states of Geneva and Switzerland, whose very nature it seems to be to live in hatred and hostility against all great and powerful nations.——But, Mr. Baring, what do you say to this? Are we the bloody minded and cowardly race here described? Is it for this description that we are to love your American brethren? Have we here a proof of that "*mildness* and *peaceableness* and *inoffen-* "*siveness*," with which you, in copying Mr. Senator Mitchell, choose to decorate the American character? Can you, Sir, have the assurance, have you acquired so much of the American nature and manners, as to look an Englishman in the face, and justify this? I have not taken much pains in selecting instances, or I could have filled this sheet from the eighteen news-papers now lying before me. Let the wretches proceed; but, I cannot say, that I should be sorry to hear that their calumnies had been answered by English bomb-shells. It is very well for you merchants and manufacturers, who have as much property in America as you have in England, and who are, by turns, subjects here and citizens there; it is very well for you to turn off this abuse with a laugh; but, for us, whose all is here; who have no double character; who must be Englishmen or nothing: for us it is not to laugh, but to resent, and, if possible, to revenge.——I have now, until some new attempt be made on the part of her advocates, done with America, whose vanity and insolence have pushed her forward into notice, and who has certainly gained nothing by notoriety. For many months, indeed, for years, I said not a word about her or her rulers; but, when it, at last, became a question, whether England were to be bullied by her, I could not hold my tongue. Her indiscreet partizans have challenged an enquiry into her resources and her character. The result is before the world. I will not pretend, that I am sorry to have had this opportunity of exposing her nakedness, to do which, though, certainly, it was my duty, was not less my inclination. She now stands before the people of England in her true shape and colour. I defy all the Barings and Roscoes upon earth to mislead them again as far as relates to her; and, whether we have war or peace with her, the knowledge thus communicated to the nation, upon a subject, with respect to which they were before more ignorant than with respect to almost any other, cannot, I hope, fail to be of great and lasting advantage.

Mr. Scott's reply to A. B. C. upon the subject of the Curate's bill, shall be inserted next week.——The *City of London proceedings* upon the Reversion Bill need not have been pointed out to me: it is a subject deeply interesting to the public.——I do not insert the *Bristol Resolutions*, because I disapprove of them, as coupling an approbation of the conduct of Sir Francis Burdett with that of the selfish proceedings of the petitioners of Liverpool. I am for seeing England free from domestic oppression; but, am willing to submit even to that, rather than urge the government to make a disgraceful and precarious peace, the natural tendency of which must be to extinguish the very hope of seeing a restoration of the liberties which our forefathers enjoyed.

Botley, 7th April, 1808.

AMERICAN STATES.

SIR;——Permit me to offer some remarks on the observations and arguments that are conveyed in a letter from an American Merchant of New Broad Street, as inserted in your Register of 26th March, p. 495; and allow me also to state some facts in addition to those he has adduced, that may perhaps contribute towards placing the subject on which he has addressed you, in a more correct point of view. This "American Merchant," (I take his signature, Mr. Cobbett, in giving him this appellation, for I am sure, judging from the line of argument he has adopted, I should libel both his feelings and his principles, were I to designate him a *British* American Merchant) after fastening on your remarks, the accusation of "rash assertions," proceeds to allow you to consider him, if you please, as acting in the capacity of counsel for America. He tells you he concedes this point "to save you all the trouble of your usual "ingenuous conjectures."—Now, the fact is, I am inclined to think, he yields thus much, in order that he may have the advantage of being really and bonâ fide considered as counsel. When I say the *advantage* of being so considered you will perceive my expression has reference to the duties and practice of a counsel, viz. to endeavour to defend his client's clause right or wrong; to suppress those truths that might make against his case, and to press forward, either under the mask of sophistry or otherwise, all the slender circumstances his ingenuity can devise in favour of it.—We will now consider this correspondent of yours, Mr. Cobbett, as counsel for America, and provided you have sufficient patience, we will travel through his arguments. After quoting your assertion that "'the neutrals

" 'do submit (to the capture by France of " 'their ships bound to England), for nei- " 'ther of them make any public remon- " 'stance or protest against the decree of " 'France,' he observes, " you say, this " in the face of the immediate explanation " of the French decree given by the minis- " ter of marine, Decrès, to the American " envoy at Paris." This appears at the first glance a formidable rebuke; but, Mr. American Merchant, have you never heard of the questions that were in the month of September put to Buonaparté himself, by the chief judge of the court of prize causes, and of the answers that were given? Perhaps not, and therefore that you may no longer remain in ignorance of them I will here give a copy of the document:

Questions put by the President of the Court of Prize Causes to the Emperor of France.

1st. Whether there shall be any exceptions to the decree of the 21st Nov. 1806 in favour of such neutrals, as, by their treaty, were allowed a fair trade on the priviledge of neutralizing property; that is to say, vessels going or coming from England with cargoes?

2d. Whether neutral vessels in ballast should also be made liable to confiscation upon the only plea of their having, even by stress of weather or capture, entered a British port?

3d. Whether half of the confiscated property should in all cases be appropriated towards indemnifying French sufferers by British spoliations?

Answers.

1st. That as the Decree contains no exception there shall be none made in its application.

2dly. This must be suffered to lay over for further consideration.

3dly. Answered in the affirmative.

Now, Mr. Cobbett, does not Buonaparté's answer to the first question flatly contradict the explanation given by Decrès? Your correspondent has facetiously observed, that doubting Decrès' explanation " is really " pretending to know better than the doc- " tor" Positively I do conceive, from the document I have just copied, that the doctor's man pretended to know better than his master, or else the master (Buonaparté) subsequently thought proper to no longer permit the Americans to be exempted from the sweeping clauses of his decree.—The next assertion produced by your correspondent is, that down to the date of the Orders in Council no vessel had been condemned either in France or Spain for trading with England, and that only two instances had then occurred even of capture, both of which were afterwards restored. Now, I can cite an instance of *actual condemnation*, and which is explained in the following Extract of a Letter received from the Continent, viz: " You may depend on it that " my information with regard to the French " Decree concerning neutrals trading with " England is correct; and as a proof of it, " I can inform you that an American, load- " ed in England for a Spanish colony, was " cast away upon the French coast, in the " Channel; and both ship and cargo have " been condemned, notwithstanding, the " property was admitted to be American." —This, then, is an instance of which I will suppose your correspondent was not aware, and I have no doubt there are still more. Yes, I say, I have no doubt there *are still more*, and I think every *impartial* man will echo my opinion, after reading the following two additional Extracts from Letters from the Continent, also written, and received in England previous to the promulgation of our Orders in Council, viz. " The " French Emperor has revived the Decree " of the 21st of Nov. 1806, in its full force, " and *it has been acted upon at Antwerp.*" Again; " A private advice has been given " within these few days past, by the Ame- " rican minister at Paris, through the me- " dium of the American consuls, to the " consigners and others concerned in Ame- " rican vessels now in this quarter, to de- " part for America without delay. I have " seen the minister's letter who gives as the " reason for advising such a step, his fear " of England letting loose her cruizers up- " on the American trade, when she learns " that France is acting upon the Decree of " the 21st Nov. last." I really think it unnecessary to say one word in the way of comment on this part of my letter.—I shall now proceed to the arguments and facts adduced by your correspondent, relative to Premiums of Insuranc You (he says) have made a gross mistatement of a plain matter of fact; and he then asserts, that the premiums of insurance *throughout* the year 1807 up to the news of the affair of the Chesapeake, were at *peace rates, being only from 3 guineas down to 2 guineas per cent.* &c. and that his own house, from April to July, only paid 2, and 2½ guineas per cent. Sir, the latter end of January (about the period we just heard of the famous Berlin Decree of 11th Nov. 1806) a policy of insurance was effected on an American vessel from Alexandria to Liverpool, at *5 guineas per cent.* and in *February*, from Liverpool to Boston, and from Liverpool to Philadel-

phia, at 6 *guineas per cent.* I could state many other instances, but they would only unnecessarily increase the length of my letter, and I know the fact cannot be contradicted, for, independent of my own individual knowledge, I could produce several of the leading underwriters in Lloyd's Coffee House as evidences to the truth of my assertion. Thus, then, premiums *did advance* from 150 *to* 200 *per cent. in consequence of the Berlin Decree*; and I can also tell you, Mr. Cobbett, that *from the same cause*, they *advanced* 100 *per cent. in America*, without (bear in mind) any public remonstrance or protest whatever on the part of the American government —I have seen a file of New York prices current, in which a table of the rates of insurances are printed, and it there appears, that *when the Berlin Decree was known in America*, the premium on a voyage to England, *which was previously* $2\frac{1}{2}$ *per cent. immediately advanced to 5 per cent.* Premiums continued at these advanced rates up to April, when I admit they again found nearly their former level, under the presumption that Buonaparté's Decree had not, *to that period*, been acted upon. But, Sir, if my information is correct, as stated in this letter, and which solemnly I believe it is, it unquestionably was *subsequently* acted upon (and that, too, previous to the promulgation of the British Orders in Council) when premiums of insurance again in consequence advanced.—How miserable a subterfuge has the American Merchant been obliged to resort to in order to prove his assertions with respect to premiums of insurance, (which he tells us is the best criterion "from which to judge "of the practical import of the famous "Berlin Decree of Buonaparté") when in order to make out his case, he has been compelled to confine himself, as relates to the premiums paid by his house, to that *immediate* period, when the public apprehension was lulled as to the execution of the said Berlin Decree; and, by the bye, Mr. Cobbett, what a curious bundle of policies must that have been from which, he says, he at *random*, took his proof; this random collection, it would appear, threw not a single policy in his way, effected from the *latter end of Jauuaay* to the *month of March*.—I shall here, Sir, recapitulate your correspondent's facts, and assertions, and at the same time place mine against them.—1st. He reminds us of the explanation given by the French minister of marine to the American envoy at Paris, relative to the Berlin Decree, and I place against it, the questions *subsequently* put to Buonaparté himself, by the president of the court of prize causes, and the answers that were returned.—2dly. He asserts that, *previous* to the issuing of our Orders in Council, *no* American vessels had been condemned under the Berlin Decree for trading with England, and that only two had been captured, which were afterwards restored, and I place against these assertions, the extracts of letters I have given, speaking generally as to the actual strict execution of the Berlin Decree, and stating one vessel had *positively* been condemned.—3dly. He roundly declares that the premiums of insurance *throughout* the year 1807, up to the news of the affair of the Chesapeake, were at peace rates, being only from 3 guineas down to 2 guineas per cent., and I prove, that when the Berlin Decree was *known* in England, premiums *advanced* from 150 *to* 200 *per cent.*, and when it was known in America, they there also advanced 100 *per cent.* I mean direct to England and Ireland.—Here, Sir, I close with your correspondent. His personal attack on yourself, and his observations relative to the title of the King of France formerly maintained by our monarchs, having been already so very successfully answered by yourself; but before I conclude my letter, allow me to assure you, that I am actuated by no other motive in writing it, than an ardent wish to assist in rendering justice to my own country, in preference to standing forward the prejudiced advocate of America and France.——I am, &c. I.—*London, 30th March*, 1808.

GENERAL ENCLOSURE.

SIR,——The observations which you have made in your present volume, p. 365, on my proposing a general enclosure act, seem to flow from the rapid conceptions of an ardent mind, when viewing a few prominent points of a great political question, and pronouncing a decision without sufficiently considering the various relations of the subject: if you would give the necessary attention to such a question, nobody would discuss it more powerfully, and I must esteem it a misfortune to the public, that the editor of a paper, the circulation of which is so considerable, should have declared himself explicitly against a measure, which I must esteem as essential to the public welfare. I beg leave to examine your objections, in the order you have proposed them.—First, you are alarmed lest such a measure should produce much confusion and litigation amongst the rights and tenures by which unenclosed lands are at present held; but this is an

jection rather to the injudicious clauses proposed to form part of such a bill, if hardly framed rather, than of necessity arising from the measure itself; such might be the effect of a badly framed bill; but I would no more be the advocate for such an act, than any other man: it is an objection grounded on a possible abuse, and were it listened to would justify every violent opposition that has been made to abundance of measures which experience has proved to be decisively beneficial.—During the first 40 years of his present majesty above 1800 enclosure acts passed, operating upon between two and three millions of acres, these acts have not proved the teeth of a paper mill, but have without doubt put an end to a multitude of litigations and have given a clear definition and much additional security to the rights and tenures by which these lands were held. Every one knows the perplexed, disputed, and litigated claims in the commonage of wastes, I would as soon assign them to the teeth of a paper mill, as leave them to the fangs of attornies. While those in Lincolnshire who had the pasture of a great common, quarreled for the right, a Scotch drover from the highlands swept off the food. The drivers for lords of manors may profit by parochial disputes, but it would be an odd argument against a general enclosure to apprehend the annihilation of such rural amusements. That 3,000,000 acres of land could by the authority of commissioners be arranged enclosed and settled without injury or inconvenience, would be too much to assert, but there is great reason to believe that the rights of those concerned have, on the balance, been greatly ameliorated.—Should it be pleaded that these results have been produced by special acts, and not a general one, I reply, that due provision may be made for the security of all rights; and such an act having passed the house of commons, (though thrown out by the lords) is a proof that, that house was of the same opinion. In fact, the objections which have been made to bear on this part of the argument, are beside the mark upon the general question: they would form the business of the committee when employed upon the clauses of the bill.—Your second objection, asks this question, "What good would it produce? Would it cause more corn to be raised? If it would, it would be a calamity; for it is now *too cheap*; at least, so have said the parliament, in the acts for exportation." But pray, Mr. Cobbett, what makes corn too cheap? The importation in the last seven years of 9,198,924 quarters, being on an average 1,314,132 quarters per annum, and your declaration is, in fact, saying that this is a right state and order of things, thus to depend on *foreign commerce* instead of raising the corn at home, which would be a calamity. You are too clear headed *thus* to state your position; but, I appeal to your candour, whether the conclusion is not fairly drawn. To me I confess that such an importation seems to be an enormous evil, and which calls for more attention than all the sugar colonies and distilleries that ever existed. And if such an importation does not imperiously call for a general enclosure of our wastes, the voice of reason can no longer be heard; and we shall be governed by the policy of card table dowagers, who, pinched on the fixed annuities of past periods, remark that they hear of nothing but improvements, and feel nothing but poverty.—*We execrate improvements.*——George, Earl of Orford, many years ago urged to me the same argument: "what can you mean, "Mr. Young, living as you do in Suffolk, "and being a good friend to Norfolk, by "proposing to cultivate waste lands? Do "not you see it would make corn cheap? "And whatever benefit it might be to some "it would certainly be mischievous to us." That conversation was followed by the importation of millions upon millions of quarters of foreign corn; and as the present government of this country is of your opinion upon the question of a general enclosure, we have no prospect in future but to import corn if we can get it, or of famine if we cannot.—Go from Bourn Bridge to Newmarket—you will find 10 miles of heath inclosed, and converted to corn, with several new farms built and established; but scarcely any other sign of increased population—none to be found further than the merely agricultural class; but, if you examine the nearest towns and villages, you will find the old blacksmiths, carpenters, wheelers, collar makers, &c. more animated in their business; but the new demands so divided through an extent of 30 surrounding miles, as to render the effects imperceptible to the eye.—Mr. Burton, a practical farmer of great experience, and a much esteemed commissioner of enclosures, gave me the following detail of what had actually resulted from the enclosure and cultivation of 10,800 acres of waste land.

PRODUCE.	£
1000 acres of wheat 2,500 qrs. at 48s. per qr. - - -	6,000
1000 acres of barley 4000 qrs. at 24s. per qr. - - -	4,800
1000 acres of oats 4000 qrs. at 20s. per qr. - - - -	4,000

	£
1000 acres of turnips feeding 500 bullocks to the profit of £3 per head - - - - -	2,500
1000 acres of grass with the offal turnips, feeding 4000 sheep in winter, and fattened by part of the new lay grass and offal in June - - - -	3,000
5000 acres of pasture supporting 500 bullocks, bringing them forward for turnips to £3 per head	1,500
Also, 4000 sheep summer kept, wool and profit on carcase -	2,000
200 cows at £6 - - -	1,200
Produce sold	£25,000

10,000 acres.
800 remaining.

5000 acres of arable demand 200 horses, wanting each 4 acres—arable and pasture 400 acres for—corn give 5 qrs. per horse for 30 weeks, or 1000 qrs. at 4 qr. per acre; 250 acres for the 1000 qrs.; 250 acres of hay 200 tons with the barns maintain them in winter: the 400 acres of pasture support them with mares and colts in summer. The improved rent £7,725. Tithe £1,500 a year. Labour £5000. Wear and tear £700. Seed £2,500. Rates £1,031. Interest of capital and small sundries £1,800, making a total of £20,256 and leaving an annual profit of £4,740.——You will see, Sir, by these particulars that these improvements were made under a very low price of corn, and a system of husbandry which, though good, is not quite correct. Labour amounting to one-fifth of the produce is pretty exactly in proportion to that of the agriculturists, and free hands in the population returns for the whole kingdom.—I have notes of many such cases, but to recite them would occupy too many of your pages No politician could examine any instance of this kind, without being convinced that the increase of human food *free in the market* had been immense.——That inclosing increases the culture of corn, appears from the returns of above 1,300 parishes, this was the case with wheat, barley, and oats, and nothing decreased but pease and beans: the increase in cattle, dairies, sheep, turnips, clover and potatoes was very great: and if such have been the effects on enclosing two millions of acres, it surpasses my comprehension, how any valid argument can be produced against the utmost extension of similar exertions: but it is easy to conceive that had not these wise measures been embraced through those forty years, we should at present, have been in a situation much the reverse of what we experience: and that man would be deemed a bold projector who should advise us, upon the question of food only, to throw open our enclosures and revert to the barbarism of our ancestors, instead of straining every nerve and exerting every means to do away, by cultivation at home, the enormous import of twelve hundred thousand quarters from a grainery, the key of which, is in the pocket of Bŏonaparté. Prevent the want of this importation before we hear one word *of the calamity* of producing too much corn.—— Your third reason for objecting to a general enclosure act is thus expressed. "Would it cause more persons to be born and raised up? Why, then, increase of consumption would go hand in hand with increase of production; and no increase of abundance would take place." There is certainly some truth here, but not, I apprehend, to the extent stated. You have repeatedly refered to the population returns, by which it appears that 1,713,289 persons employed in agriculture feed the total of 9,343,578, or in the proportion of every person in agriculture feeding himself and more than four others in different employments: and you will note that this is besides supporting all the live stock employed in the cultivation. Should it be contended that such new establishments would have the effect of creating a proportional increase in those other classes not included in the agricultural enumeration; I reply, that this is contrary to all experience: and more especially, at a moment when the manufacturing classes are under the least depression in the demand for their fabrics. The waste lands are scattered through every county, and almost through every district of every county in the kingdom. A great number of the farmers who would undertake the cultivation may already live in the vicinity of the wastes: artizans for the supply of the farmers unquestionably live in such vicinity. As to clothing, furniture, &c. &c. the warehouses and shops of the neighbouring towns would supply a far greater demand immediately: the industry of many existing traders would be animated without the necessary supposition of an increase, or, at least, of a very small one. The mere agriculturists would certainly increase, but as they contribute so largely to feed others the more they increased the better. Hence then, it is plain to a demonstration, that the increase of consumption would not go hand in hand with the increase of cultivation; and that the culture of the wastes must be considered as a great resource by which to compensate for the importation of foreign corn. In this respect improvement upon the extended

scale of some millions of acres in England only, would be a direct confirmation of what I have seen so often exemplified in the parliamentary enclosures of great commons, which have added so considerably to the productions of the kingdom; yet with a very small corresponding augmentation in the numbers of the people: in some cases, particularly in Lincolnshire, with too small an augmentation, the result of not building cottages sufficient even for the cultivators of the soil.—But a remark may be made here on cultivating wastes, when instigated by the expectation of scarcity: the law that gives the power of enclosure, might require that every man in proportion to the quantity of wastes broken up, should cultivate annually a certain quantity of potatoes: such a requisition would at once do away every possible apprehension of an increasing culture without a diminished importation. The more deeply we consider this subject the more clearly will it appear, that it must be, by means of this root that any effective steps can be taken to provide a preventative against expected scarcity. Nor should it be forgotten, that there is no crop more proper for commencing these operations on wastes. I have seen 400 bushels per acre gained in October, from lands which in February were covered with heath whins and fern.——I have dwelt the longer on this point, because I know some very able men, who from what they call *principles*, are of opinion that an extension of culture is only an extension of the kingdom *as it is:* and leaving the deficiencies of food the same as before. That they are in an error I have not the smallest doubt. Sitting by their fire sides will do for talking of reason and principles, but it is not sufficient for the attainment of that conviction which results from examination on the spot, in the villages, farms, and cottages of the country. Your last objection, Sir, is founded upon the insufficient cultivation of old lands long since enclosed; which you say ought to be improved to the utmost before wastes are taken in: but I am strangely mistaken if the past facts of the last forty years do not afford something like a refutation of this remark. A large proportion of the two millions of acres enclosed in the first forty years of the present reign are now under a very capital cultivation: above half a million of those acres were absolutely waste, now covered with the waving ears of ample harvest, or grazed by great herds of cattle and sheep, where geese and ponies were once the only stock: Dr. Price was as famous for paradoxes as for calculation; he declared as violently against enclosures as you can do: I will not pay your talents so bad a compliment as to call him the Cobbett of that day, and yet the remark which you make was just as applicable then as it is now; the old enclosures were vilely cultivated; but the politicians of that day did not successfully urge (fortunately for us at present) that, as a reason against the new speculations.—The fact is, that the state of the old enclosures cannot, in argument, be connected with the smallest degree of propriety with the expediency of new undertakings, and for this plain reason, such old enclosures are in the occupation of men who pay the rent their landlords demand: and the proprietors of the farms who may have known the fathers and grand fathers of these tenants would not be very likely to listen to advice the object of which would be to distress and ruin hundreds of families turned adrift in favour of men of more skill and greater capitals. Speaking generally land already occupied is no more at our disposition than land in the moon. And the question is, whether farmers having skill and capital but wanting business shall not be employed on waste. because certainold farms are badly cultivatede Such reasons and such motives appear to me to verge upon absurdity.—I am very ready to agree with you, Sir, that a better cultivation of old enclosed lands is greatly to be desired, and there are some circumstances and cases in which it would be even more advantageous than improving the wastes, as it would be done at a far less expense, but such exertions must depend on the general policy of the kingdom: on a commutation for tithe: on leases being universally given to tenants manifesting a disposition or a power to improve: and above all, on securing to them a higher price of corn than they have received for the last seven years.—It remains, Sir, for your readers to judge whether the measure of a general inclosure act would indeed be a monument of folly; or the basis of wealth of power and prosperity. I think it might be so framed as to prove a decided means of public security;—an irrefragable proof of attention to great and important interests. That it would improve the morals and animate the industry of the people! encrease the revenue of the public and prove in the event a MONUMENT OF NATIONAL WISDOM.—I have the honour to be, &c. &c.—ARTHUR YOUNG.—*March 26*, 1808.

OFFICIAL PAPERS.

PORTUGAL.——*Correspondence relative to the Portuguese Trade. Feb.* 9, 1808.

SIR,——I having received your letter

of the 8th instant, and notwithstanding my great wish to forward the trade at present (as far as it may lay in my power, without intruding upon the authority of his Royal Highness the Prince Regent, my master), I must confess that I found the same difficulty as the consul general did, in making out such a specific list of goods, formerly permitted to be imported into Portugal, as would set my mind, and that of all the merchants who wish to trade to the Brazils, at rest: but as I can at all times depend upon the noble and liberal principles of his Royal Highness, I hope I have hit upon a medium that will take off every difficulty, by inserting in a letter which I myself wrote to the Governor of St. Catherine's, the following postscript, which you may communicate to all persons concerned:—"Having met with an insurmountable difficulty to ascertain every article that was, or was not formerly admitted into Portugal, I must observe to you, that in case you should find in the manifesto signed by the Consul General, and countersigned by me, any article that was formerly prohibited, I beg you would ascribe the insertion to my ignorance of the fact, and not to any malice or bad faith on the part of the shippers; therefore you will be so good as to allow the sale of them for this time, or request instructions from the government of his Royal Highness."—One of the causes of the difficulty in making the list you desire proceeds from the circumstance, that some goods were prohibited as being of royal manufactories or monopolies, which at present may be wanted in the Brazils, and not received from Portugal, therefore I return the list that you may frame your manifest, excluding from it the following articles which were clearly prohibited in Portugal:—— Prohibited Goods.—Silks, not plain and flowered:—N. B. The uncertainty of this article is saved by the P. S. Salt, liquors and wines, not the growth of Portugal; lace of gold and silver; playing cards; cotton goods of every description.——I do not know but that in future some of the above articles may be admitted, but I believe it much wiser to proceed now regularly, and to sacrifice a momentary privation to unnecessary trouble.

I remain, &c.

CHEVALIER DE SOUZA COUTTINHO.

Mr. John Nodin, Spring-gardens.

Copy of a Letter from his Excellency the Portuguese Ambassador. London, Feb. 12.

SIR,——In reply to your letter of this day, I have not only to refer you to my printed letter to the Governor of St. Catherine's, but I am beside bound in honour not to conceal from you, nor from any of the concerned, that in a letter, I myself wrote to the Governor, he is requested not to admit any ship to a clearance, whose master will not present to him the licence of the Privy Council, the manifest signed by me, and my printed letter.——All my letters to the said Governor having been written in concert with his Majesty's ministers, and my report to his Royal Highness the Prince Regent, made accordingly. I do not answer for any deviation from the established regulations.—

I am, Sir, &c.

To Mr. H. Nodin, Commercial Agent, Tower street, London.

FRENCH PRISONERS. —— *Communication transmitted from the Transport Office in reply to all applications made by Prisoners of War in England, for Passports to enable them to return to France.*

Transport Office.

SIR,——The Commissioners for his Majesty's Transport Service, and for the care and custody of prisoners of war, have received your letter of the ; and in return, I am directed to acquaint you, that it is the determination of his Majesty's government not to allow any more French officers to go from this country to France, until the French government shall make some return for the very great number of French officers already sent, or shall agree to a cartel of exchange upon the fair principle of man for man, and rank for rank, according to the usual plan of civilized nations, and as repeatedly proposed by the commissioners without effect. I am, however, to acquaint you, that if the French government will send over to this country a British prisoner of equal rank to effect your exchange, or will officially certify to the commissioners, that upon your arrival in France such British prisoner shall be released, orders will immediately, on receipt of such certificate, be given for your liberation.—You will under these circumstances clearly perceive, that your detention here is entirely owing to your own government, to which any application you may think proper to make on the subject, will of course be duly forwarded.—— As it is probable, that you may not be sufficiently acquainted with the English language, to understand perfectly this letter, a translation of it into French, is given on the other side hereof.—I am, &c.

(Signed) By the Secretary.

Printed by Cox and Baylis, No. 75, Great Queen Street, and published by R. Bagshaw, Brydges Street, Covent Garden, where former Numbers may be had; sold also by J. Budd, Crown and Mitre, Pall Mall.